

Comment Summary:
Offshore wind energy generation project
Horseshoe Shoals, Nantucket Sound

Section 10 Permit Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Cape Wind Associates, LLC

Prepared for:
US Army Corps of Engineers
New England District
696 Virginia Road
Concord, MA 01742-2751

File No. 200102913

NOTE: This document summarizes comments received by the
New England District through April 24, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS	page #
INTRODUCTION	4
TABLE 1: COMMENTERS VIA ORAL TESTIMONY	5-6
TABLE 2: COMMENTERS VIA WRITTEN TESTIMONY	7-8
TABLE 3: COMMENTERS VIA E-MAIL TESTIMONY	8-9
1.0 PROJECT GOAL AND JUSTIFICATION	10
2.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS	10
3.0 PROJECT NEED	11
4.0 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	11
5.0 PERMITTING PROCESS	11
6.0 LAND JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY	11
7.0 WIND TECHNOLOGY	11-12
8.0 ENERGY SOURCE	12
9.0 FUEL DIVERSITY	12
10.0 ENERGY INDEPENDENCE	12
11.0 ELECTRICITY RATE CHANGE	12
12.0 FISCAL IMPACTS	12
13.0 ENVIRONMENTAL TRADEOFFS AND BENEFITS	13
14.0 BALANCE OF BENEFITS	13
15.0 HUMAN HEALTH BENEFITS	13
16.0 EDUCATIONAL, DEMONSTRATIONAL, AND TOURISM OPPS	13
17.0 JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY	13
18.0 CONSTRUCTION DETAILS AND FACILITY DESCRIPTIONS	14
19.0 INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REMOVAL	14
20.0 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS	14

21.0	IMPACTS ON PROPERTY VALUES AND TAX REVENUES	14
22.0	IMPACTS ON RECREATION AND TOURISM	15
23.0	NAVIGATIONAL IMPACTS	15
24.0	MARINE HABITAT IMPACTS	15
25.0	AVIAN IMPACTS	16
26.0	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL IMPACTS	16
27.0	AVIATION IMPACTS	16
28.0	LANDFALL IMPACTS	16
29.0	COMMUNICATION AND TRANSMISSION NETWORK IMPACTS	16
30.0	SAFETY AND SECURITY	16
31.0	PUBLIC INTERESTS	17
32.0	DATA COLLECTION	17
33.0	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION	17

INTRODUCTION

In November 2001 the US Army Corps of Engineers, New England District, received an application for a single scientific data gathering tower in waters outside of Massachusetts. Public notice for the tower was issued December 4, 2001, with a comment period extended to February 4, 2002. An application for the entire 170 turbine wind farm and connecting transmission lines was also received in November 2001. In December 2001, the District determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), was required for the overall wind farm project. EIS scoping meetings were held March 6 & 7, 2002, at the JFK Federal Building, 55 New Seabury Street, Boston, Massachusetts, and the Mattacheese Middle School, 400 Higgins Crowell Road, West Yarmouth, Massachusetts, respectively. The purpose of the scoping sessions was to assist the District in defining the issues to be evaluated in the EIS. All interested Federal, State and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, interested private and public organizations, and individuals were invited to attend the scoping meetings. The attached Comment Summary document summarizes comments received by the District through April 24, 2002. Comments were received verbally at the two EIS scoping meetings, in writing, and by e-mail. This Summary document does not replace the comments themselves; it is merely a tool to organize the comments received into subject matter categories.

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 1 represents Commenters who provided an oral testimony. Table 2 represents Commenters who provided a written testimony. Table 3 represents Commenters who provided testimony via e-mail. Comment Numbers for the organizations or individuals that submitted comments are used to identify the authors of comments throughout the document. Commenters who made particular comments are listed by number in brackets following each comment.

Table 1
COMMENTERS VIA ORAL TESTIMONY

Commenter Number	Oral Testimony
1	Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound (Kurker, Wayne, Co-founder)
2	Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound (McLaughlin, Charles)
3	Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound (O'Brien, John)
4	Argo, Elizabeth
5	Ashworth, Craig
6	Association for the Preservation of Cape Cod (Geist, Maggie, Executive Director)
7	Bergman, Paul
8	Bothwell, Robert
9	Buckley, Stephen
10	Cape Cod Commission (Dascombe, Philip, Planner)
11	Cape Cod Group of the Sierra Club (Neill, Chris, Chairman)
12	Cape Light Compact (Mahoney, Bob, Chairman)
13	Cape Wind Associates (Rodgers, Mark, Communications Director)
14	Chartier, David (Dighton Power Facility)
15	Christensen, Marybeth
16	Competative Power Coalition of New England, Inc. (Costello, Neal, General Council)
17	Crawford, Richard
18	Curren, Mary Jane
19	Deeley, Michael (representing himself, his family, the McGraw family, and the Gerson family)
20	Doliner, Susan
21	Donahue, Dennis
22	Donheiser, Alan
23	Earth Tech, Inc. (Cotton, Douglas, Senior Program Director representing Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound)
24	Gegenwarth, Richard
25	Gibson, Bruce (Cape Clean Air)
26	Gibson, Bruce William
27	Glusman, Murray
28	Goddard, Allen
29	Goggins, Karen
30	Granby, Alan
31	Granda, Chris
32	Gulliver, Cate
33	HealthLink (Hamlin, Nancy)
34	HealthLink (Howard, Jody)
35	HealthLink (Nadeau, Lynn)

36	HealthLink (Palma, Thomas, Esquire)
37	Hickman, Peter
38	Hirst, Peter
39	Holmgren, Viola
40	Horsley and Whitten (Garpow, Wendy representing Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound)
41	Hyannis Port Yacht Club (O'Keeffe, Timothy)
42	Hyland, Janice
43	Jay Cashman, Inc. (Gryniewicz, Franklin)
44	Jones, Robert
45	Kelly, Grant
46	Kenney, Peter
47	Lanahan, Mike
48	Lang, Clayton
49	Lowell, Francis (Pete)
50	MA Commercial Fishermen's Association (Borjeson, Ronald, Vice President)
51	MA Fishermen's Association (Chipperfield, Gerald, Representative)
52	MA House of Representatives (Atsalis, Demetrius, Representative)
53	MA House of Representatives (Drinan-Bowes, Susan representing Provost, Ruth, Representative)
54	MA Marine Traders Association (Spillane, John W., General Council)
55	MA State Senate (Fargo, Susan, Senate Chair of the Joint Committee on Energy)
56	MacMullan, John
57	Manwell, James (Director, Renewable Energy Research Lab, University of Massachusetts)
58	McIlveen, Edward
59	Nutter, McClennen, and Fish, LLC (Butler, Patrick representing Alliance for the Preservation of Nantucket Sound)
60	Nutter, McClennen, and Fish, LLC (Leon, Michael, Esquire representing Alliance for the Protection of Nantucket Sound)
61	Olsen, Richard
62	Palmer, Bryant
63	Schlicher, Fred (Northeast Sustainable Energy Association)
64	Scolles, Susan
65	Stimpson, Christopher
66	Stoll, Roger
67	Teller, Michael S.
68	Three Bays Preservation (Counsell, Lindsey, Program Manager)
69	Three Bays Preservation, Inc. (Counsell, Lindsay, Program Manager)
70	Three Bays Preservation, Inc. (Egan, Michael)
71	Traer, Ann
72	Trueblood, Jeff
73	US Army Corps of Engineers, New England District (Godfrey, Christine, Chief, Regulatory Branch)
74	US Army Corps of Engineers, New England District (Holtham, Susan, EIS Project Advisor)
75	Wrightson, Frederick

Table 2
COMMENTERS VIA WRITTEN TESTIMONY

Commenter Number	Written Testimony
76	Acker, David E.
77	American Lung Association of Massachusetts, Inc. (Alvarez, Carlos, Executive Director)
78	Barker, Robert and Evelyn
79	Bodurtha, James H.
80	Boone, Amber
81	Buzzards Bay Action Committee (Gagne, Michael, Chairman)
82	C.H. Newton Builders, Inc. (Newton, David L., Vice President)
83	Cape Cod Commission (Fenn, Margo, Executive Director)
84	Cape Cod Commission (Kadar, Susan, Subcommittee Chair)
85	Cape Cod Group of the Sierra Club (Neill, Christopher, Chair)
86	Cape Cod Plastic and Hand Surgeons, Inc. (Bentivegna, Peter E.)
87	Cetto, Teresa
88	Christensen, Marybeth
89	Coastwise Packet Co. (Douglas, Robert)
90	Cross, Michelle M.
91	Cross, Peter L.
92	Diehl, Patricia J.
93	Doliner, Joan
94	Doliner, Michael J.
95	Donheiser, Dr. Alan
96	Doucette, Loretta, G.
97	Dunn, Patricia
98	Earth Tech, Inc. (representing Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound)
99	Egan, Michael
100	Frantzen, Bill
101	Frazee, Robert P.
102	Gillit, William
103	Gookin, Barbara
104	Harco, Marion
105	HealthLink (Bright, Jane, President and Nadeau, Lunn, Board Member and Founder)
106	Healthlink (Gozemba, Patricia)
107	Hoppensteadt, Thomas R.
108	Horsley and Whitten, Inc. (representing Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound)
109	Hyannis Area Chamber of Commerce
110	Hyannis Area Chamber of Commerce (Farnham, Henry C., Vice President)
111	Hyannis Port Yacht Club (O'Keeffe, Timothy, Commodore)
112	Krause, Earl
113	Lalley, Judith
114	Lang, Clayton T.
115	MA Audubon Society (Clarke, John J., Director of Advocacy)
116	MA Energy Consumers Alliance (Chretien, Larry, Executive Director)
117	MA Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (Trubey, David W., Deputy Director for Victor T. Mastone, Director)

118	MA Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, Office of Coastal Zone Management (Skinner, Thomas W., Director)
119	MA Fishermen's Partnership (Bergeron, David, Coordinator)
120	MA House of Representatives (Koczera, Robert M., State Representative)
121	MA House of Representatives, Joint Committee on Energy (Binienda, John J., Ass. Majority Leader)
122	Marketing International, Inc. (Rich, George W.)
123	McPheeters Family
124	Mimken, Nicholas B.
125	Minerals Management Service (Drucker, Barry)
126	Molloy, Kenneth H.
127	Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission (Topham, Alvin S., Chairman)
128	Northeast Sustainable Energy Association (Leon, Warren, Executive Director)
129	Nutter, McClennen, and Fish, LLP (representing Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound)
130	Odell, Nancy and John
131	Osterville Village Association (Barrette, Thomas L., President)
132	Outward Bound, Thompson Island Education Center (Armstrong, George P., President)
133	Page, Christopher I.
134	Palmer, Bryant
135	Putnam, Brent
136	Save Popponesset Bay, Inc. (Harrington, Kevin F., Chairman)
137	Schlicher, Fred J.
138	Schwinn, Donald
139	Town of Dartmouth, MA (Gonsalves, Leonard M., Selectman)
140	Town of Rumford, ME (Welch, Robert C., Town Manager)
141	Toxics Action Center (Wilson, Matthew, Director)
142	US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, New England Field Office (Bartlett, Michael J., Supervisor)
143	US Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service (Hartgen, Carol A., Chief, International Activities and Marine Minerals Division)
144	US Environmental Protection Agency (Varney, Robert W., Regional Administrator)
145	Walton, Jane
146	Wilson, Elizabeth Mumford
147	Wright, Whitney P.
148	Yarmouth Area Chamber of Commerce
149	Yarmouth Area Chamber of Commerce (Dubois, Robert, Executive Director)

Table 3
COMMENTERS VIA E-MAIL TESTIMONY

Commenter Number	E-mail Testimony
150	Amsler, Megan and Robinson, Robert
151	Barton, Jaci
152	Benoit, Michael
153	Bertrand, Carli

154	Canzano, Edward E.
155	Cleveland, David
156	Demakis, Paul C.
157	Duffy, James
158	Ellis, Chris
159	Fardy, Alice
160	Fardy, George and Alice
161	Gazaille, David and Donna
162	Haffenreffer, Laurie
163	Herrick, Anne
164	Heywood, Ed
165	Heywood, Laura
166	Hill, Jason
167	Hintze, Michael
168	Hoagland, John H.
169	James, Deborah
170	Jette, Jackie
171	Johnson, Erik
172	Kurland, Charles and Karen
173	Matton, Heidi
174	McKeown, Tom and Linda
175	Murphy, Paul
176	Nantucket Sound Windmill Plant (group e-mail, approx. 360)
177	Noble, Paul and Anne
178	Paul, Robert D.
179	Peckman, Richard W.
180	Peterson, Rich
181	Salter, Russell
182	Scalzi, Jim
183	Shepley, Hamilton
184	Soule, Peter W.
185	SouthCoast emPOWERment Compact, Inc. (Slattery, Joseph L., Chairman)
186	Suprenant, Al
187	Vince, Amy
188	Violette, Alison
189	Walsh, Phyllis and Bill
190	Warner, Kate
191	Wind Park Project on Horseshoe Shoal (group e-mail, approx. 465)
192	Windmill Plant on Horseshoe Shoal (group e-mail, approx. 160)
193	Windmill Plant Project on Nantucket Sound (group e-mail, approx. 430)

1.0 PROJECT GOAL AND JUSTIFICATION

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the project plan has not, to date, had a clear project goal, and that the Scope should require that a clear and appropriate purpose and need statement be used as the foundation for developing the range of alternatives for analysis. Some Commenters state that the purpose and need statements should describe the project justification, including location, scale, and magnitude. Some Commenters state that the project purpose should be defined as the production of electricity available for use in the New England power grid, thereby shaping the alternatives to include: all reasonable generation sources, locations, and capacities.
[84, 108, 142, 143, 144]

2.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the Scope should involve establishing a range of reasonable alternatives that are practical and feasible from a technical and economic standpoint. Some Commenters state that the range of alternatives should include renewable energy generation at both on- and off-shore locations, of different sizes and capacities, and should include combinations of sources and/or types of facilities that could supply power to the New England power grid. Some Commenters state that the investigation of alternative sites should include areas outside Massachusetts' territorial waters. Some Commenters would like the appropriateness of the geographical location and size of the facility to be assessed, with particular focus on the project size relative to the overall size of the resource area in which it will be situated.
[1, 6, 10, 11, 17, 23, 27, 30, 31, 32, 37, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 60, 66, 68, 70, 71, 75, 78, 82, 85, 86, 87, 98, 99, 102, 103, 110, 111, 116, 126, 136, 144, 143, 127, 84, 102, 107, 108, 115, 118, 122, 142, 148, 151, 157, 159, 161, 163, 168, 170, 174, 175, 179, 180, 181]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state their desire to understand the assumptions and methodologies used when making decisions on proposed alternatives. Some Commenters would like a smaller pilot project to be implemented before the larger-scale project.
[1, 6, 10, 11, 17, 23, 27, 30, 31, 32, 37, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 60, 66, 68, 70, 71, 75, 78, 82, 85, 86, 87, 98, 99, 102, 103, 110, 111, 116, 126, 136, 144, 143, 127, 84, 102, 107, 108, 115, 118, 122, 142, 148, 151, 157, 159, 161, 163, 168, 170, 174, 175, 179, 180, 181]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the Scope should involve the examination of the need for power in the New England Power grid, and should involve an investigation of the capacities of existing facilities and facilities that are not yet built but are under consideration. Some Commenters state that recently proposed, approved, or constructed energy projects should provide useful data for determining what constitutes a viable commercial scale facility.
[1, 6, 10, 11, 17, 23, 27, 30, 31, 32, 37, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 60, 66, 68, 70, 71, 75, 78, 82, 85, 86, 87, 98, 99, 102, 103, 110, 111, 116, 126, 136, 144, 143, 127, 84, 102, 107, 108, 115, 118, 122, 142, 148, 151, 157, 159, 161, 163, 168, 170, 174, 175, 179, 180, 181]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that all appropriate Federal and State agencies should participate in assessing the range of alternatives to be considered. The Commenter states that a close interagency coordination throughout the preparation of the EIS/EIR is critical. The Commenter states that a draft EIS/EIR should be distributed to each of the interagency groups for review.
[144]

3.0 PROJECT NEED

COMMENT: Some Commenters would like to have a complete assessment of the need for renewable energy. Some Commenters have requested that the EIS include a full alternatives analysis of current and future power demands in the New England region, and potential energy sources and sites for the generation of electrical power for transmission to the New England power grid.

[11, 22, 23, 28, 39, 58, 64, 75, 84, 92, 95, 102, 107, 110, 112, 118, 124, 128, 143, 151, 189]

4.0 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

COMMENT: Some Commenters would like a cost analysis to be conducted, which should include the amount of money required to implement wind technology and the amount of money saved as a result of implementing wind technology. Some Commenters would like information on the market value of wind power and its economic competitiveness with other energy sources.

[10, 11, 22, 75, 95, 189]

5.0 PERMITTING PROCESS

COMMENT: The Commenter states the need for the Secretary of Environmental Affairs to clarify that the DEIR and FEIR are required.

[84]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the permitting process needs to be explained more clearly to the public. Some Commenters state that the permitting process needs to be refined. Some Commenters stress the importance of taking the permitting process seriously.

[6, 11, 12, 13, 23, 54, 59, 60, 63, 137]

6.0 LAND JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that public trust implications of siting a facility in Federal waters needs to be addressed. Some Commenters would like further discussion of the issues related to the use of State and Federal waters by for-profit entities. Some Commenters state their concern for site jurisdiction. Some Commenters state that there is no mechanism in place for resolving significant public trust issues that pertain to resource allocation and use within the proposed project area.

[2, 12, 28, 44, 46, 50, 51, 54, 59, 60, 66, 79, 84, 86, 88, 101, 111, 118, 122, 130, 142, 143, 144, 148, 152, 177]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that they are interested in knowing if the US should be compensated for use of Horseshoe Shoals for the proposed activities.

[59, 99]

7.0 WIND TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the alternatives analysis should consider the rate of development of new wind technology and the likelihood that currently infeasible alternatives may become feasible in the near future.

[144]

COMMENT: Some Commenters would like more information on the technique of wind energy, including credentials and past experiences. Some Commenters suggest that the applicant reference examples where this technique has been implemented. Some Commenters are interested to know more about alternative energy implementation in European countries. Some Commenters are interested in how improvements of energy efficiency can be accomplished.
[6, 7, 11, 24, 29, 32, 35, 36, 39, 44, 50, 58, 60, 66, 68, 84, 85, 92, 96, 103, 108, 153, 177, 189]

8.0 ENERGY SOURCE

COMMENT: The Commenters are supportive of the potential opportunity to improve renewable energy resources, increase energy efficiency, reduce energy costs, and reduce pollution.
[4, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18, 26, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 43, 47, 53, 55, 56, 57, 63, 65, 67, 72, 76, 77, 80, 81, 104, 105, 106, 115, 116, 120, 121, 128, 132, 136, 139, 141, 150, 155, 156, 158, 167, 171, 182, 184, 185, 187, 188, 190, 191]

9.0 FUEL DIVERSITY

COMMENT: The Commenters are supportive of the potential to increase fuel diversity, reduce dependence on other forms of energy, reduce dependence on foreign oil, and address national security issues.
[6, 16, 18, 26, 36, 38, 43, 55, 65, 72, 76, 77, 80, 81, 104, 105, 121, 128, 145, 155, 156, 158, 167, 171, 178, 184, 185, 191]

10.0 ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

COMMENT: The Commenters are supportive of the opportunity for Cape Cod and the Islands to take responsibility for their own power needs and to be leaders in wind power technology.
[18, 35, 36, 55, 65, 72, 153, 155, 156, 167]

11.0 ELECTRICITY RATE CHANGE

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the alternatives analysis should include the potential for impacts on electricity rates in New England. Some Commenters request an investigation of fuel diversity opportunities, and the potential for future supply constraints, reliability problems, and price increases associated with over-reliance on a particular fuel source.
[11, 19, 32, 38, 47, 52, 60, 75, 85, 86, 102, 109, 130, 144, 149, 177, 179]

12.0 FISCAL IMPACTS

COMMENT: Some Commenters state the desire to clarify the potential for the sale of power to the grid and the resulting cost savings to users on the Cape and the Islands. Some Commenters state the need for the EIS/EIR to describe the potential renewable energy for the region and project its market share potential. Some Commenters are interested to know what the specific fiscal impacts on towns will be. Some Commenters specify their interest in knowing if there will be tax breaks associated with this project, or if tax-payers will be required to subsidize some of the project's costs.
[28, 46, 58, 64, 70, 75, 84, 86, 95, 99, 103, 109, 127, 130, 149, 177, 189]

13.0 ENVIRONMENTAL TRADEOFFS AND BENEFITS

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that an assessment of the relative environmental tradeoffs of each alternative should be provided. Some Commenters state that environmental benefits and avoided impacts should be discussed when comparing renewable vs. nonrenewable forms of energy production. Some Commenters state the desire for detailed documentation to substantiate the claim that the affect of implementing this green technology will result in a reduction in total emissions. Some Commenters are particularly interested in learning more about the potential for air quality improvements and greenhouse gas reductions. Some Commenters would like an assessment of the amount of fossil fuel that is displaced as a result of using wind power. Some Commenters would like to know how this green approach would reduce this country's dependency on foreign oil. Some Commenters would like to know how this green technology would affect our consumption of other more polluting forms of energy.
[25, 31, 38, 47, 72, 84, 85, 108, 127, 144, 151]

14.0 BALANCE OF BENEFITS

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should balance the benefits of utilizing green technology against the visual, environmental, and economic impacts of the facility. Some Commenters state the need for a quantified assessment of the value of the natural resources that exist within the proposed project area.
[51, 60, 75, 127, 144]

15.0 HUMAN HEALTH BENEFITS

COMMENT: Some Commenters would like to know more about the affects of fossil fuel emissions on human health.
[25, 35, 47, 85]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested to know what the specific health impacts on towns will be, as a result of associated improvements to air quality.
[84, 85]

16.0 EDUCATIONAL, DEMONSTRATIONAL, AND TOURISM OPPORTUNITIES

COMMENT: Some Commenters are supportive of the potential for using this project as an educational and demonstrational tool. Some Commenters suggest that this project may result in increased tourism.
[7, 18, 36, 67, 145, 150, 160]

17.0 JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested to learn more about employment opportunities for local residents, such as the number of jobs that will become available, what types of work will be required, and the duration of the employment period. Some Commenters would like to know how this project could assist Cape Cod and the Islands in becoming a more sustainable community.
[18, 31, 35, 55, 84, 105, 108, 116, 121, 128, 153, 158, 178]

18.0 CONSTRUCTION DETAILS AND FACILITY DESCRIPTIONS

COMMENT: Some Commenters would like details regarding specific construction protocols, such as placement of staging areas, transportation routes, and ports that will be used. Some Commenters are interested to know what types of mitigation measures will be used during cable and tower installation. Some Commenters would like to know what measures will be taken to manage for waste (hazardous and non-hazardous) materials that are generated during construction.
[84, 85]

COMMENT: The Commenter requests a list of all the materials needed for a complete Development of Regional Impact (DRI) application as part of the DEIR filing. The Commenter requests descriptions of the facilities in further detail, including an outline of the provisions made for treatment of all wastes associated with the platforms.
[84]

19.0 INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REMOVAL

COMMENT: The Commenters request details on the installation and maintenance of the cable (on land and in water). Some Commenters request that the EIR/EIS contain a legal/regulatory analysis of the permitting process for an activity such as this, which may be subject to the Clean Water Act, Section 403 (33 U.S.C. § 1343). Some Commenters believe the EIS/EIR should include a maintenance schedule for the cable and towers.
[15, 20, 23, 49, 62, 79, 84, 85, 92, 108, 134, 142, 149]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state the need for a standard operating procedure for the removal of the facility and the restoration of Horseshoe Shoals, in the event that the project fails. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should provide an analysis of anticipated structural fatigue and a replacement schedule based on past experiences with the materials that will be used.
[2, 5, 15, 19, 20, 32, 58, 75, 84, 92, 95, 99, 102, 107, 118, 126, 127, 146, 175, 179, 189]

20.0 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that visual and auditory impacts need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters state the need for a frame of reference for judging the height and visual impact of the towers. Some Commenters are concerned about the potential for impairment on the local character, tradition, heritage, local culture, and legacy.
[1, 2, 3, 19, 24, 27, 28, 32, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52, 61, 62, 64, 66, 70, 79, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 94, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 107, 108, 110, 111, 116, 119, 122, 123, 126, 127, 130, 136, 138, 144, 146, 147, 149, 154, 160, 161, 162, 166, 169, 172, 175, 176, 177, 179, 186, 189, 193]

COMMENT: The Commenters believe that the wind farm will enhance/not impair aesthetic value and allow Cape Cod and the Islands to make a statement.
[4, 14, 26, 33, 34, 55, 80, 106, 145, 158, 178]

21.0 IMPACTS ON PROPERTY VALUES AND TAX REVENUES

COMMENT: The Commenters state that impacts to coastal property values and town tax revenues need to be assessed in greater detail.
[28, 68, 70, 93, 99, 101, 177, 189]

22.0 IMPACTS ON RECREATION AND TOURISM

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that primary and secondary impacts to the local and regional economy (recreation, tourism, fishing) need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters specify the need to understand the affects on local trade markets, such as fishing and tourism.

[1, 3, 15, 20, 27, 30, 32, 39, 41, 52, 60, 61, 62, 66, 84, 85, 88, 99, 100, 101, 102, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 116, 122, 124, 127, 136, 138, 144, 148, 149, 160, 161, 165, 166, 173, 176, 177, 181, 183, 189, 192, 193]

23.0 NAVIGATIONAL IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that commercial and recreational navigation/use impacts that result from the installation, maintenance, and operation of the cables before, during, and after construction need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters state that they are concerned about safety issues associated with boat navigation, adverse weather conditions (such as fog), inaccurate maps, and nighttime conditions. Some Commenters request that consultation with commercial fishermen be conducted throughout the planning stages of the project. Some Commenters stress the importance of identifying and addressing the potential impacts of the project on the commercial fishing industry.

[1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 23, 24, 32, 39, 41, 50, 51, 60, 64, 68, 75, 78, 84, 85, 88, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108, 111, 114, 116, 119, 123, 124, 133, 138, 142, 144, 147, 148, 149, 152, 161, 166, 169, 172, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182, 186, 189, 192, 193]

COMMENT: The Commenter suggests that the towers can serve multi-purposes (i.e. assist boat navigators).

[26]

24.0 MARINE HABITAT IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that marine impacts to recreational and commercial fisheries, marine mammals, benthic habitat, circulation and physical conditions (vibration, sound, shading, alterations to current, scouring, sediment transport, structural habitat alteration, and wave disturbance), and overall ecology that result from the installation, maintenance, and operation of the cables before, during, and after construction need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters would like additional information regarding the proposed project's affects on both protected and Federally managed mammal species. Some Commenters are interested in understanding the short- and long-term impacts on water quality. Some Commenter's would like to know what mitigation efforts for reducing the impacts on marine resources are being proposed.

[6, 11, 20, 21, 23, 32, 39, 50, 51, 64, 68, 75, 84, 85, 92, 98, 99, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 115, 116, 119, 123, 127, 131, 138, 142, 144, 149, 177, 193]

COMMENT: The Commenters suggest that the base of each tower might provide a unique marine habitat environment.

[26, 34, 55, 145, 150, 155, 158, 178, 184]

25.0 AVIAN IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that avian impacts (collision, loss of habitat, migratory disruption, feeding requirements) that result from the installation, maintenance, and operation of the cables before, during, and after construction need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters state the need for documentation on the proposed plan's affect on bird migrations, based on research specific to Nantucket Sound. Some Commenters would like the EIS/EIR to include a thorough documentation of existing bird usage patterns in the area to enable adequate evaluation of the project's risk. Some Commenters would like a detailed characterization of bird habitats and migration to be conducted, with particular focus on Roseate Terns and Piping Plovers. Some Commenters are concerned about the potential for birds to nest on the wind structures. [6, 11, 29, 32, 39, 40, 64, 68, 75, 84, 85, 86, 92, 98, 99, 102, 106, 107, 108, 115, 116, 127, 131, 142, 144, 177, 193]

26.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the potential for impact on archaeological and cultural resources located on the seafloor. Some Commenters would like an investigation to be conducted to determine what types of archaeological and cultural resources exist, if any. Some Commenters would like what forms of impact mitigation will be implemented if archaeological resources exist within the project area. Some Commenters would like the Massachusetts Historical Commission and other appropriate agencies to be notified if historical and archaeological resources are identified. [84, 92, 117]

27.0 AVIATION IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that aviation impacts need to be assessed in greater detail. [1, 23, 32, 84, 124, 127, 144, 177, 179]

28.0 LANDFALL IMPACTS

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that landfall impacts to estuarine and wetland environments that result from cable installation and maintenance need to be assessed in greater detail. Some Commenters are concerned about the impacts on residential areas that are adjacent to the proposed site of cable landfall. [15, 20, 23, 40, 84, 85, 92, 94, 108, 149]

29.0 COMMUNICATION AND TRANSMISSION NETWORK IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that communication and transmission networks impacts need to be assessed in greater detail. [98, 144]

30.0 SAFETY AND SECURITY

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned with national safety and security issues that might be associated with this type of technology. [92, 99, 102, 147]

31.0 PUBLIC INTERESTS

COMMENT: The Commenters stress the importance of considering public interests (economics, aesthetics, cultural values, energy needs, recreation, and the needs and welfare of the people) in all facets of the decision-making process.
[98]

32.0 DATA COLLECTION

COMMENT: The Commenters recommend that additional sediment analyses be conducted, including dispersal and settling capabilities of the sediment. Some Commenters request information regarding the circulation patterns within Lewis Bay. Some Commenters suggest that understanding the impacts on hydrodynamic and sedimentary processes is critical.
[98, 108]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that data that has been presented to date has been either exaggerated or under estimated.
[37]

COMMENT: The Commenter suggests that all information provided by consultants be referenced.
[37]

33.0 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

COMMENT: The Commenters would like to have information, including a draft of the EIS/EIR, made available to the public. Some Commenters suggest developing a very detailed web-based information center that represents this project and serves to educate the public on alternative energy sources.
[6, 9, 11, 85, 118, 137]